UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/574,395	05/19/2000	Jeff Cook	252/109	7205

28875 7590 12/01/2003

SILICON VALLEY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 721120
SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120

EXAMINER	
FAKHRAI, SAM S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	8

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/574,395	COOK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sam Fakhrai	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Monday, November 10, 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *2 and 10-22* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 14, line 15, "may stored" should be replaced with "may be stored."

Page 15, lines 15-18, sentence must be revised to make sense.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 10-22 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding Claim 10, on lines 1 and 2, it appears that "has changed" needs to be removed.

Regarding Claims 11-22, these claims depend from independent Claim 10 and therefore inherit its deficiencies.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2 and 17 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The "user" has already been claimed as a "certificate user" in preceding Claims 1 and 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "the first module" in lines 1 and 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. If claim 23 were to be interpreted as dependent upon claim 1, the metes and bounds of the claim would not be clearly and distinctly delineated. As such, a member of the public would not be able to determine the point where he/she might infringe. Accordingly, because the Examiner is unable to ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention, he is unable to search and/or apply art at this time. The examiner suggests that this claim has been mistakenly labeled as dependent from Claim 1, and should be changed to be labeled as dependent from any of claims 10-22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,688 to Moses et al.

Regarding Claim 1, Moses et al. discloses:

- In a system adapted for monitoring for changes in condition of one or more electronic certificates, and adapted for communication with a user of the one or more electronic certificates, a method for notification of a change in condition of an electronic certificate, comprising (See column 3, lines 1-11):
  - Detecting a change in condition of the electronic certificate (See Figure 3 and corresponding text in column 6, lines 21-23); and
  - Notifying the user of the electronic certificate of the change in condition (See Figure 3 and corresponding text in column 6, lines 26-28).

Regarding Claim 2, Moses et al. discloses:

- The user is a certificate user of the electronic certificate (See column 3, lines 1-7).

Regarding Claim 3, Moses et al. discloses:

- The method of Claim 2, further comprising allowing the certificate user to download an updated version of the electronic certificate (See: "Updates 32, 34, and 36" of Figure 1, and corresponding text in column 5, lines 10-15; and column 6, lines 26-35).

Regarding Claim 4, Moses et al. discloses:

- Forwarding an updated electronic certificate to the certificate user concurrently with the step of notifying, thereby updating the electronic certificate (See: "Updates 32, 34, and 36" of Figure 1, and corresponding text in column 5, lines 10-15; and column 6, lines 26-35).

Regarding Claim 9, Moses et al. discloses:

- The change in condition detected in the detecting step consists of a change in condition selected from the following group: revocation of, roll-over of, change in field of, disablement of, or expiration of the electronic certificate (See column 6, lines 43-48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,688 to Moses et al., as applied to Claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,703 to Arledge et al.

Regarding claims 5-7, Moses et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claim 2, as discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 2, but does not disclose:

- Notifying the certificate user by electronic mail.
- Notifying the certificate user by telephone using an electronic voice messaging system.
- Notifying the certificate user by providing a paging signal to a pager for the recipient.

Arledge et al. discloses a system comprising:

- Electronic mail (See: column 3, lines 37-66, and column 4, lines 1-6 and "E-Mail Server 11" of Figure 1).
- An electronic voice messaging system (See: column 3, lines 37-66, and column 4, lines 1-6 and "Voice Mail System 7" and "Phone Network 5" of Figure 1).
- Providing a paging signal to a pager for the recipient (See: column 3, lines 37-66, and column 4, lines 1-6 and "Paging Server 13" of Figure 1).

Moses et al. could have been modified by Arledge et al. to arrive at the claimed inventions in the following ways:

- The step of notifying the certificate user of a change in certificate could comprise notifying the certificate user by electronic mail.
- The step of notifying the certificate user of a change in certificate could comprise notifying the certificate user by telephone using an electronic voice messaging system.
- The step of notifying the certificate user of a change in certificate could comprise notifying the certificate user by providing a paging signal to a pager for the recipient.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Moses et al. by Arledge et al. as described above because Moses et al. requires a means of communicating the change in certificate to the certificate user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to apply the above modification because electronic mail, telephone using an electronic voice messaging system, and providing a paging signal to a pager for the recipient are communication methods. Furthermore, employing the above communication methods allows Moses et al. to communicate the change in certificate to the certificate user.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moses et al. as applied to Claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,055,519 to Kennedy et al.

Regarding claim 8 Moses et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claim 2, as discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 2, and the reference further discloses:

- The types of changes to certificates that are notified to the user (See column 6, lines 43-48).
- The way changes to certificates are notified to the user (See "message", column 7, lines 5-7).
- The diligence with which changes to certificates are notified to the user (See: column 6, lines 38-41; and "message", column 7, line 5).

However, Moses et al. does not disclose:

- The price of notifying certificate changes to users.
- Negotiating a contract with the certificate user regarding the type, way, diligence, and price of notification.

Kennedy et al. discloses:

- Aspects of a sale are negotiated between a buyer and a seller (See Figure 1).

The examiner notes the following:

- 1) Given that resources are dedicated to the step of notifying a certificate user of a change in electronic certificate, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to require payment from the user for this notification service.

- 2) Given that aspects of a sale are negotiated between a buyer and a seller as in Kennedy et al. above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary in the art that a contract could then be generated to reflect the aspects agreed upon as a result of the negotiation. The purpose of the contract would be to make the result of the negotiation legally binding.

Moses et al. could have been modified by Kennedy et al. and the examiner's notes, to arrive at the claimed invention in the following way:

- The step of negotiating as taught in Kennedy et al. could be combined with the examiner's note 2 to be a contract negotiation.
- The above contract negotiation could be combined with establishing the type, way, and diligence of notification disclosed in Moses et al., and the establishing of a price of notification as taught by the examiner's note 1 above.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the above modification because the motivation for the including establishing a price for notification has been discussed above in the examiner's note 1. Also, the motivation for the contract negotiation is that the system is then more fully optimized to meet the needs of the certificate users. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to apply the above modification because a price could be established for the notifications. Also, the four notification attributes, namely type, way, diligence, and price, could be contract negotiated with the certificate user.

Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,688 to Moses in view of Anthony Ralston et al., ENCYCLOPEDIEA OF COMPUTER SCIENCE: *MODULAR PROGRAMMING*, 3rd Edition, International Thomson Computer Press, 1995, pp. 899 (from here on "Ralston").

Regarding claim 10, Moses et al. discloses:

- A processor (See Figure 2 and corresponding text in column 5, lines 51-55);
- A computer program executable on the processor (See Figure 2 and corresponding text in column 5, line 51-55);
- Detecting a change in condition of an electronic certificate (See Figure 3 and corresponding text in column 6, lines 21-23); and
- Notifying a user of the electronic certificate of the change in condition (See Figure 3 and corresponding text in column 6, lines 26-28).

However, Moses et al. does not disclose:

- A first executable module for detecting the change in condition of an electronic certificate.
- A second executable module for notifying the user of the change.

Ralston discloses:

- A program module is a logically self-contained part of a larger program (See lines 1-3).

Moses et al. could have been modified by Ralston to arrive at the claimed inventions in the following way:

- The step of detecting a change in condition of an electronic certificate could have been carried out by a first executable module.
- The step of notifying a user of the change could have been carried out by a second executable module.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to apply the above modification because the steps of detecting a change and notifying a user of the change are logically self-contained parts of a program. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the above modification because good program design is greatly enhanced by modular programming (See Ralston, page 899, paragraph 5).

Regarding claim 17, note that the additional limitation is disclosed by Moses et al. of the Moses et al. and Ralston combination as applied to Claim 10 above. Specifically, Moses et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claim 10, with respect to Claim 10 above, and also discloses:

- The user of the electronic certificate comprises a certificate user of the electronic certificate (See Moses, column 3, lines 1-7).

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moses et al. in view of Ralston, as applied to Claim 10 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,687,235 to Perlman et al.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Moses et al. and Ralston discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claim 10, with respect to Claim 10 above, but does not disclose:

- The electronic certificate is stored on a first server.

Perlman et al. discloses:

- The electronic certificate is stored on a first server (See column 6, line 1 and "CERTIFICATE STORAGE SERVER 204" of Figure 2).

The combination of Moses et al. and Ralston could have been modified by Perlman et al. to arrive at the claimed inventions in the following way:

- The system of Claim 10, wherein the electronic certificate is stored on a first server.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the above modification because the combination of Moses et al. and Ralston requires storage of electronic certificates. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to apply the above modification because a server can be used as a storage device.

Regarding claim 12, note that the additional limitation is disclosed by Moses et al. of the Moses et al., Ralston, Perlman et al. combination as applied to Claims 10 and 11 above.

Specifically, Moses et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claim 11, with respect to Claims 10 and 11 above, and also discloses:

- The first server comprises the processor on which the computer program is stored and the first and second executable modules are executed (See column 5, lines 43 and 51-57).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moses et al. in view of Ralston, U.S. Pat. No. 5,687,235 to Perlman et al., as applied to Claims 10-12 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,983,228 to Kobayashi et al.

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Moses et al., Ralston, and Perlman et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter of Claim 11, with respect to Claims 10 and 11 above, and also discloses:

- A processor comprises a first server (See Moses et al. column 5, lines 43 and 51-57).

However, the combination of Moses et al., Ralston, and Perlman et al. does not disclose:

- A first executable module stored on a first server.
- A second executable module stored on a second server.

Koybayashi et al. discloses:

- A first executable module comprises a first server (column 5, lines 3-5).
- A second executable module comprises a second server (column 5, lines 3-5).

The combination of Moses et al., Ralston, and Perlman et al. could have been modified by Kobayashi et al. to arrive at the claimed invention in the following way:

- The processor and the first and second executable modules that comprise one server as disclosed by Moses et al. could comprise separate servers as disclosed by Kobayashi et al., with the processor comprising the same server as the first executable module.

The examiner notes the following:

- It is well known to use two servers instead of one, where a higher a speed of processing is required.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the above modification because the use of separate servers improves the speed with which the system operates as discussed in the examiner's note above. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to apply the above modification because the two modules could be placed onto separate servers.

MPEP 2104.44, VI, B. Duplication of Parts

In re Harza, 274, F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960) (Claims at issue were directed to a water-tight masonry structure wherein a water seal of flexible material fills the joints which form between adjacent pours of concrete. The claimed water seal has a "web" which lies ** in the joint, and a plurality of "ribs" ** >projecting outwardly from each side of the web into one of the adjacent concrete slabs. <The prior art disclosed a flexible water stop for preventing passage of water between masses of concrete in the shape of a plus sign (+). Although the reference did not disclose a plurality of ribs, the court held that mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced).

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moses et al. in view of Ralston, U.S. Pat. No. 5,687,235 to Perlman et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,983,228 to Kobayashi et al., as applied to Claim 13, above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,537,533 to Staheli et al.

Regarding Claim 14, the combination of Moses et al., Ralston, Perlman et al., and Kobayashi et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claim 13, with respect to Claims 10, 11, and 13, above, but does not disclose:

- A communication channel between the first and second servers for connecting the first server to the second server such that data communications may occur between the first and second servers.

Staheli et al. discloses:

- A communication channel between first and second servers for connecting the first server to the second server such that data communications may occur between the first and second servers (See Figure 1 and corresponding text on column 8, lines 52-54).

The combination of Moses et al., Ralston, Perlman et al., and Kobayashi et al. could have been modified by Staheli et al. to arrive at the claimed invention in following way:

- The system of Claim 13 could be combined with a communication channel between first and second servers for connecting the first

server to the second server such that data communications may occur between the first and second servers.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the above modification because the detecting and notifying modules need to communicate with one another. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the above modification because a communication channel between first and second servers for data communications would allow data communication between two servers.

Regarding Claim 15, the combination of Moses et al., Ralston, Perlman et al., and Kobayashi et al., discloses all of the claimed subject matter of Claim 14, with respect to Claims 10, 11, 13, and 14, above, but does not disclose:

- The electrical connection comprises a network, first and second servers each having a network interface for data communications in the network.

Staheli et al. discloses:

- The electrical connection comprises a network, first and second servers each having a network interface for data communications in the network (See Figure 1 and corresponding text on column 9, lines 25-31).

The combination of Moses et al., Ralston, Perlman et al., and Kobayashi et al. could have been modified by Staheli et al. to arrive at the claimed invention in following way:

- The system of Claim 14 could have been combined with the electrical connection that comprises a network, first and second servers each having a network interface for data communications in the network, as taught by Staheli et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the above modification because the detecting and notifying modules need to communicate with one another. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the above modification because a network and network interfaces allow communication between the two modules.

Regarding claim 16, note that the additional limitation is disclosed by Perlman et al. of the Moses et al., Ralston, Perlman et al. and Kobayashi et al. combination as applied to Claims 13-15 above. Specifically, Perlman et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter of Claim 15, with respect to Claims 10,11 and 13-15 above, and also discloses:

- The first server comprises a certificate server (See column 6, line 1 and "CERTIFICATE STORAGE SERVER 204" of Figure 2).

Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moses et al. in view of Ralston, as applied to Claims 10 and 17 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,055,519 to Kennedy et al.

Regarding Claim 18, the combination of Moses et al. and Ralston discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claims 10 and 17, as discussed above with respect to Claims 10 and 17, and also discloses:

- The types of changes to certificates that are notified to the user (See column 6, lines 43-48).
- The way changes to certificates are notified to the user (See "message", column 7, lines 5-7).
- The diligence with which changes to certificates are notified to the user (See: column 6, lines 38-41; and "message", column 7, line 5)..
- The use of a third module.

However, the above combination does not disclose:

- The price of notifying certificate changes to users.
- Negotiating a contract with the certificate user regarding the type, way, diligence, and price of notification.

Kennedy et al. discloses:

- Aspects of a sale are negotiated between a buyer and a seller (See Figure 1).

The examiner notes the following:

- 1) Given that resources are dedicated to the step of notifying a certificate user of a change in electronic certificate, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to require payment from the user for this notification service.

- 2) Given that aspects of a sale are negotiated between a buyer and a seller as in Kennedy et al. above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a contract could then be generated to reflect the aspects agreed upon as a result of the negotiation. The purpose of the contract would be to make the result of the negotiation legally binding.

Moses et al. could have been modified by Kennedy et al. and the examiner's notes, to arrive at the claimed invention in the following way:

- The step of negotiating as taught in Kennedy et al. could be combined with the examiner's note 2 to be a contract negotiation.
- The above contract negotiation could be combined with establishing the type, way, and diligence of notification disclosed in Moses et al., and the establishing of a price of notification as taught by the examiner's note 1 above.
- The above contract negotiation could comprise a third module in the computer program, as taught by Ralston.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to apply the above modification because a price could be established for the notifications. Also, the four notification attributes, namely type, way, diligence, and price, could be contract negotiated with the certificate user. Furthermore, the contract negotiation could be a third module in a computer program. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the above modification because the motivation for the including establishing a price for notification has been discussed above in the examiner's note 1.

Also, the motivation for the contract negotiation is that the system is then more fully optimized to meet the needs of the certificate users. Furthermore, the motivation for the use of a third module is the same as that discussed in the rejection of Claim 10 above.

Regarding Claim 19, note that the additional limitation is disclosed by Moses et al. of the Moses et al., Ralston combination as applied to Claims 10, 17, and 18, above. Specifically, Moses et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter of Claim 18, as discussed above with respect to Claims 10, 17, and 18, and also discloses:

- The processor is further for forwarding an updated electronic certificate to the certificate user, thereby updating the electronic certificate with respect to the certificate user (See Moses: "Updates 32, 34, and 36" of Figure 1, and corresponding text in column 5, lines 10-15; and column 6, lines 26-35).

Regarding Claim 20, note that the additional limitation is disclosed by Moses et al. of the Moses et al., Ralston combination as applied to Claims 10, 17, and 18, above. Specifically, Moses et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claim 18, as discussed above with respect to Claims 10, 17, and 18, and also discloses:

- The processor is further for allowing the certificate user to download an updated version of the electronic certificate from a certificate server (See Moses: "Updates 32, 34, and 36" of Figure 1, and corresponding text in column 5, lines 10-15; and column 6, lines 26-35).

Regarding Claim 21, note that the additional limitation is disclosed by Moses et al. of the Moses et al., Ralston combination as applied to Claims 10, 17, and 18, above. Specifically, Moses et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter regarding Claim 18, as discussed above with respect to Claims 10, 17, and 18, and also discloses:

- A plurality of electronic certificates, wherein the electronic certificate for which the processor detects a change in condition comprises one of the plurality of electronic certificates (See: column 3, line 66 and column 4, lines 1-3; and column 4, lines 53-57).

Regarding Claim 22, note that the additional limitation is disclosed by Moses et al. of the Moses et al., Ralston combination as applied to Claims 10, 17, 18, and 21, above. Specifically, Moses et al. discloses all of the claimed subject matter of Claim 21, as discussed above with respect to Claims 10, 17, 18, and 21. Moses et al. also discloses:

- The first module is for detecting a change in condition of one or more of the plurality of electronic certificates, and the second module is for notifying one or more respective certificate users of the change in condition of the respective electronic certificate based on the contract negotiated by the third module (See above discussion of Claims 10, 17, 18, and 21, and the examiner's note below).

The examiner notes the following:

- Given that a module exists for negotiating a contract for the terms of notifying a user of a change in electronic certificates, and a module exists for notifying a user of a change in electronic certificates, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to limit the actions of the notifying module based on the negotiated contract.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Fakhrai whose telephone number is 703-305-8767. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30 AM – 6:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached at 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100